



ERIC GIBSON
DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017
www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dplu

AUGUST 30, 2010

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)

1. Title; Project Number(s); Environmental Log Number:

Dictionary Hill, Rezone, R08-002; STP10-010, ER08-19-003
2. Lead agency name and address:
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
San Diego, CA 92123-1666
3.
 - a. Contact: Larry Hofreiter, Project Manager
 - b. Phone number: (858) 694-8846
 - c. E-mail: Larry.Hofreiter@sdcounty.ca.gov.
4. Project location:

Maria Avenue and San Carlos Street with the Spring Valley Community Planning Area in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. APN 584-200-66, 67, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, AND 78.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1291, Grid C/4
5. Project Applicant name and address:

Dictionary Hills Developers
333 Midway Drive #201
San Diego, CA 92110

6. General Plan Designation Estate Development Area
Community Plan: Spring Valley Community Plan
Land Use Designation: (6) Residential
Density: 7.3 du/acre
7. Zoning
Use Regulation: A-70 (Limited Agricultural)
Minimum Lot Size: 8 acre(s)
Special Area Regulation: --

8. Description of project:

The project is a Rezone to change the setback requirements on nine existing undeveloped lots located at Maria Avenue and San Carlos Street in the Spring Valley Community Planning area. The project also involves a Site Plan permit for lot 6/7 and lot 30, which will require an 8' foot non-combustible wall to be installed when building permits are issued for these lots.

The Rezone would change the setback designator from C to N to accommodate eight single family residential homes and one non-buildable lot on nine vacant lots. The setback requirements would replace the current 60 foot front yard setback, with a 50 foot front yard setback and replace the 15 foot interior side yard setback requirement to 5 feet. Grading for the proposed residential lots would be under the amounts that require a grading permit.

The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category (EDA) Estate Development Area, Land Use Designation (6) Residential - 7.3 du/ac. Zoning for the site is A-70 with an 8-acre minimum lot size. The project would be served by sewer from Spring Valley Sanitation District and imported water from the Otay Water District. The lots must annex into the San Diego County Street Lighting District. The following project design considerations are also being implemented to minimize environmental impacts: fuel management over lot 30, the construction of a fire suppression wall along the east and south sides of lot 6/7 and along the south side of lot 30; and off-site mitigation for impacts to native vegetation.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

Lands surrounding the project site are used for single family homes on small lots ranging from ½ acre to 3,300 sq. ft. Additionally, the Sweetwater River preserve is located just south of the project site. The site is located approximately 1 mile from State Route 125.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Rezone	County of San Diego
Site Plan Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Water District Approval	Otay Water District
Sewer District Approval	Spring Valley Sanitation District
Fire District Approval	San Miguel Fire Protection Districts

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- [Aesthetics](#)
- [Agriculture and Forest Resources](#)
- [Air Quality](#)
- [Biological Resources](#)
- [Greenhouse Gas Emissions](#)
- [Cultural Resources](#)
- [Geology & Soils](#)
- [Hazards & Haz. Materials](#)
- [Hydrology & Water Quality](#)
- [Land Use & Planning](#)
- [Mineral Resources](#)
- [Noise](#)
- [Population & Housing](#)
- [Public Services](#)
- [Recreation](#)
- [Transportation/Traffic](#)
- [Utilities & Service Systems](#)
- [Mandatory Findings of Significance](#)

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

“ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Larry Hofreiter
Printed Name

Date

Land Use/Environmental Planner
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

- b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

Less Than Significant Impact:

Based on a site visit completed by County staff Tim Taylor on July 17, 2010 the proposed project is located near or within the viewshed of a scenic vista. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying land cover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The visual environment of the subject scenic vista extends from the Sweetwater River dirt trail from approximately the cul-de-sac at Aladena Court in the east to the cul-de-sac of Sacramento Avenue in the west. The visual composition consists of native vegetation occurring throughout the preserve area and small, single family residences sitting atop of the hillside over looking the Sweetwater Reservoir.

The proposed project is a Rezone to change the setback requirements on nine residential lots. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be limited to those quantities not requiring a Grading Permit. The project will be compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality because the proposed single family residences and the proposed 8' CMU wall is consistent with the existing residential development in the area. Single family residences that have fences and walls placed along their rear property line are located along the entire northern viewshed, to the east and west of the project site. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were

evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII cannot be seen from the Sweetwater River dirt trail; they are not located within this scenic vista viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic ([Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program](#)). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

Less than Significant Impact: Based on a site visit completed by Tim Taylor on July 17, 2010 the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The project site is located over a mile away from the SR-125 Highway and cannot be seen from the highway due to intervening topography. The project proposes single family residences in area dominated by single family residences. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because the Dictionary Hill project site cannot be seen from SR-125. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as higher density residential development on relatively small lots in the immediate area north of the Sweetwater Reservoir, and native vegetation occurring throughout the preserve area to the south.

The proposed project is a Rezone to change the setback requirements on nine residential lots, Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be limited to those quantities not requiring a Grading Permit. The project involves split foundation construction resulting in little to no cut or fill slopes. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment's visual character and quality because single family residences occur immediately east and west of the project site.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because those projects cannot be seen from the Sweetwater River dirt trail. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain any agricultural resources, lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact The project site is zoned A-70, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project will not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because single family residences are a permitted use in A-70 zones and will not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there will be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

- c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site including offsite improvements do not contain forest lands or timberland. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project is consistent with existing zoning and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones.

- d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of offsite forest resources.

- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

No Impact: The project site does not contain any agricultural resources, lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project proposes development that was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below the screening levels, and subsequently will not violate ambient air quality standards.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project proposes a Rezone to change the setback requirements on nine residential lots. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be limited to those quantities not requiring a Grading Permit. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 80 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Less Than Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction activities, and also as the result of increase of traffic from project implementation. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be limited to those quantities not requiring a Grading Permit. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, localized and temporary resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 80 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM₁₀, or any O₃ precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project will introduce the following new "sensitive receptors" into the project area: residents. However, based on consultation with DPLU staff air quality specialist and a site visit conducted by Tim Taylor on July 17, 2010, the project is not located within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of any identified point source of significant emissions. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Biological resources on the project site were evaluated in a biological letter report prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt (June 18, 2010). A prior biological survey of this site was completed by Affinis in 1990 (Biological Survey Report for the Polselli Property, L-1979, Log No. 90-13-1) and was incorporated in the June 18, 2010 report. The project is a zone reclassification to change standard setback requirements from 60 feet to 50 feet and interior side yard setbacks from 15 feet to 5 feet. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be limited to those quantities not requiring a Grading Permit. Residential development is proposed on 8 of the 9 existing lots with the other lot to be developed with a turnaround for the extensions La Presa Avenue. The project is located in Unincorporated Land in the Metro-Lakeside Jamul Segment of the MSCP.

The project site supports 0.25-acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub, 0.91-acre of disturbed land, and 0.40-acre of developed land. The Diegan coastal sage scrub habitat onsite are described as three discontinuous patches. One of the patches in the southeastern portion of the site is occupied by approximately 30 coast barrel cactus (*Ferocactus viridescens*), a County List B plant. Other sensitive species observed were San Diego County needle grass (*Achnatherum diegoensis*), San Diego County viguiera (*Viguiera laciniata*), and a pair and one fledgling of California gnatcatchers (*Polioptila californica*) were observed foraging in the coastal sage scrub habitat. Two additional species were observed during the 1990 Affinis survey: San Diego cactus wren (*Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus sandiegensis*) and Bewick's wren (*Thryomanes bewickii*), but they were not observed foraging or nesting during the updated surveys.

The project proposes impacts to 0.25-acre of coastal sage scrub onsite and 0.06 acre offsite, coast barrel cactus, San Diego County needle grass, and San Diego County sunflower. The San Diego County needle grass and sunflower are County List D plant, which requires habitat-based mitigation under the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO). Impacts to at least 30 individual species of coast barrel cactus, a County List B plant, would result in potentially significant adverse effects to a rare plant species. However, avoidance of the coast barrel cactus onsite is not feasible due to existing physical constraints; such as the small size of each of the existing lots, the distribution of coast barrel cactus, the adjacent dense development to the north and west, and the existing onsite disturbances. Since avoidance of the coast barrel cactus onsite is not feasible, the existing properties were determined to be unsuitable for onsite conservation of biological resources. Additionally, the project will place an 8 foot high non-combustible wall along the southwestern property boundary to reduce risks associated with wildfires. The wall would also preclude offsite fire clearing associated with any future structures onsite.

Offsite mitigation through salvage and translocation for impacts to the rare plant population will reduce such impacts to a level below significance. In addition, the purchase of coastal sage scrub habitat at a ratio of 1:1 is required under the Biological

Mitigation Ordinance and will be mitigated prior to the public review. This will result in a minimum purchase of 0.31-acre of Tier II or higher Tier habitat in the MSCP.

The project has the potential to impact the California gnatcatcher, San Diego cactus wren, and migratory birds through habitat impacts and edge effects. The project, however, will be conditioned to avoid all brushing, clearing, or grading during this species sensitive breeding season (February 15th through August 31st). Other project conditions include a biological monitor, and an approved final Salvage and Translocation Plan that would include contingency measures to ensure 100 percent survival success.

County staff has reviewed past, present, and probable future projects located within the project site and has determined that the cumulative loss of coastal sage scrub habitat that supports sensitive species is significant, however, this project's contribution to the cumulative habitat loss will be less than cumulatively considerable upon the transplantation and salvage of coast barrel cactus, and the offsite acquisition of a minimum of 0.31-acre Tier II or higher Tier habitat of similar function and value within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP).

The purchase of offsite habitat within a larger preserved area will reduce this project's contribution to direct, indirect, and cumulative biological impacts by contributing to the development of large, biologically viable areas that support candidate, sensitive, or special status species. Therefore, staff has determined that although the site supports native biological habitat and species, the removal of this habitat will not result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications, to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
b	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on County records and Biological Letter Report prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt dated June 18, 2010, the site contains no riparian habitat. However, the site does support coastal sage scrub habitat, which is recognized as sensitive natural communities by the County, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

The project proposes direct impacts from private roads, residential pads, and private driveways. The project will impact approximately 0.31-acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub and will mitigate for these impacts in an offsite mitigation location through the preservation of Tier II or higher Tier habitat within the MSCP. Compensation for the direct, indirect, and cumulative loss of habitat will be accounted for with the pre-determined mitigation ratios applicable to the habitat type and location within the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO) at a 1:1 ratio.

As detailed in response a) above, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to sensitive natural communities identified in the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, MSCP, Fish and Game Code, and Endangered Species Act are considered less than significant through the implementation of the following conditions: the offsite acquisition of land consisting of at least 0.31-acre of Tier II or higher Tier habitat in the MSCP, final approval of a Salvage and Translocation Plan, a biological monitor, and restricting all brushing, clearing and/or grading such that none will be allowed during the breeding season of California gnatcatchers and migratory bird species.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on County records and the Biological Letter Report prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt dated June 18, 2010, staff has determined that the proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
----	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------

.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation ..
Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on County records and the Biological Letter Report prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt dated June 18, 2010, this project is part of an approved Habitat Conservation Plan located within the Unincorporated Metro-Lakeside Jamul Segment of the MSCP. The project proposes direct impacts from private roads, residential pads, and private driveways. The existing lot sizes are relatively consistent with the surrounding lots, which are existing privately-owned single family residences located north, west, and northeast. Compensation for the direct, indirect, and cumulative loss of native habitat will be accounted for with the pre-determined mitigation ratios applicable to the Tier level, and the purchase of mitigation land within a larger preserve area that will remain in perpetuity. Although the property will be impacted directly from residential development and associated indirect impacts, it is expected that existing wildlife using this site for movement, foraging, and breeding will not be burdened by this proposed development because the project is surrounded by existing development with the only undeveloped areas located to the south and southeast which limits connectivity of wildlife movement through the existing lots and would not be burdened by future construction of single-family residences. Therefore wildlife will continue to utilize the site and impacts to wildlife corridors and nursery sites will be less than significant.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

.. Potentially Significant Impact .. Less than Significant Impact
b Less Than Significant With Mitigation ..
Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The project is located within Unincorporated Lands in the Metro-Lakeside Jamul Segment of the MSCP and proposes impacts to a County Group B plant species known as the coast barrel cactus. The BMO requires no less than 80% preservation onsite for all Group A and B plants. However, given the small size of each of the existing lots, surrounding development, existing onsite disturbance, and distribution of the species onsite, minimizing impacts below 20% for coast barrel cactus cannot be achieved.

Therefore, the County is proposing an Exception to the BMO as stated in SEC 86.509(b) of the BMO. This exception will only apply to the requirement for 80% onsite

preservation of the Group-B plant, coast barrel cactus. The proposed project will comply with all other applicable BMO and Subarea plan requirements.

SEC 86.509(b) states: "In certain cases, during CEQA [California Environmental Quality Act] review and/or design of a project, site specific physical conditions, including but not limited to geology, slope, or location of infrastructure, may be identified which make it infeasible for the project to meet all the goals and criteria or other requirements in the Subarea Plan, but the project could be constructed without compromising the conservation of species and habitats pursuant to the Subarea Plan. The exception shall be the minimum necessary to afford relief and accommodate development. In such instances, the County may grant an exception to this ordinance in conjunction with granting an exception to the Subarea Plan. An exception to the Subarea Plan requires the concurrence of the Wildlife Agencies."

This project qualifies for this exception due to existing physical constraints. These constraints include: 1) the small size of each of the existing lots proposed for development, 2) the distribution of coast barrel cactus, prohibiting any viable preservation efforts, and 3) the site is already surrounded by dense development to the north, west, and northeast and prone to disturbance, thereby making this property unsuitable for conservation of biological resources. Such constraints preclude the onsite species-based mitigation requirements set forth in SEC 86.507(b) of the BMO. Since it would be infeasible for the project to maintain any viable portion of the onsite population of coast barrel cactus, the exception outlined in SEC 86.509(b) of the BMO, is applicable to this project. However, the loss of the coast barrel cactus population onsite still constitutes a significant impact. Mitigation for the loss of coastal sage scrub and for impacts to the coast barrel cactus population onsite will contribute to the species and habitat conservation goals of the MSCP Subarea plan, and will reduce the level of significance of the proposed impacts. This project was brought to the Wildlife Agencies (CDFG and USFWS) on November 20, 2008.

As described above, the project proposal involves impacts to 100% of the biological resources onsite and within the offsite fire clearing area. These resources include 0.31-acre of Diegan coastal sage scrub, and up to 30 individuals of coast barrel cactus.

The purchase of coastal sage scrub in a County-approved mitigation bank in the MSCP, and the salvage and translocation of coast barrel cactus into the San Miguel Habitat Management Area will be conducted prior to public review. Therefore, the proposed project has been found to conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance.

Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated August 30, 2010 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area

Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Philip de Barros of Professional Archaeological Services on May 7, 2007, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological resources report titled, "*Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report of a 1+-Acre Parcel South of San Carlos Street Between Maria and La Presa Avenues Spring Valley, San Diego County, California*", dated May 10, 2007, prepared by Philip de Barros of Professional Archaeological Services.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist Philip de Barros of Professional Archaeological Services on May 7, 2007, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. A light flake scatter, CA-SDI-4773, was recorded on this and adjacent properties in 1974. Considerable effort was taken to relocate any of the original scatter, however, no artifacts or features were identified during the current survey. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled, "*Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report of a 1+-Acre Parcel South of San Carlos Street Between Maria and La Presa Avenues Spring Valley, San Diego County, California*", dated May 10, 2007, prepared by Philip de Barros of Professional Archaeological Services. Grading monitoring is not required, however, the project must

comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

No Impact: The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance. However, because the project is not proposing any grading, there will be no impact to potentially unique paleontological resources.

- e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Philip de Barros of Professional Archaeological Services, on May 7, 2007, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. A light flake scatter, CA-SDI-4773, was recorded on this and adjacent properties in 1974. Considerable effort was taken to relocate any of the original scatter, however, no artifacts or features were identified during the current survey. Grading monitoring is not required, however, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled, "*Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report of a 1+-Acre Parcel South of San Carlos Street Between Maria and La Presa Avenues Spring Valley, San Diego County, California*", dated May 10, 2007, prepared by Philip de Barros of Professional Archaeological Services.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997,

Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the geologic environment of the project site is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Based on a review of the 2002 Geologic Map of the Jamul Mountains 7.5' Quadrangle, the site is underlain by Pleistocene age well consolidated alluvial deposits and no landslides have been mapped at or near the site. Due to the consolidated nature of the geologic unit and the lack of known landslides, this geologic unit has a generally low level of risk for landslides to occur. Therefore, there it is anticipated that there will be no potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from adverse effects of landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Huerhuero-Urban land complex, 9 to 30% slopes that has a soil erodibility rating of "slight" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. Moreover, the project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be limited to those quantities not requiring a Grading Permit. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

- c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be limited to those quantities not requiring a Grading Permit. The proposed project is consistent with the geological formations underlying the site. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are Huerhuero-Urban land complex, 9 to 30% slopes. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact:

The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. A service availability letter dated Aug. 14, 2007 has been received from the Spring Valley Sanitation District indicating that the facility has adequate capacity for the projects wastewater disposal needs. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. A regional GHG inventory prepared for the San Diego Region¹ identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

¹ San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory: An Analysis of Regional Emissions and Strategies to Achieve AB 32 Targets. University of San Diego and the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC), September 2008.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

According to the San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory (2008), the region must reduce its GHG emissions by 33 percent from “business-as-usual” emissions to achieve 1990 emissions levels by the year 2020. “Business-as-usual” refers to the 2020 emissions that would have occurred in the absence of the mandated reductions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. Development of regional targets is underway and SANDAG is in the process of preparing the region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which will be a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy will identify how regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

In addressing the potential for a project to generate GHG emissions that would have a potentially significant cumulative effect on the environment, a 900 metric ton threshold was selected to identify those projects that would be required to calculate emissions and implement mitigation measures to reduce a potentially significant impact. The 900 metric ton screening threshold is based on a threshold included in the CAPCOA white paper² that covers methods for addressing greenhouse gas emissions under CEQA. The CAPCOA white paper references the 900 metric ton guideline as a conservative threshold for requiring further analysis and mitigation. The 900 metric ton threshold was based on a review of data from four diverse cities (Los Angeles in southern California and Pleasanton, Dublin, and Livermore in northern California) to identify the threshold that would capture at least 90% of the residential units or office space on the pending

² See CAPCOA White Paper : “CEQA & Climate Change: *Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act*” January 2008 (<http://www.capcoa.org/rokdownloads/CEQA/CAPCOA%20White%20Paper.pdf>).

applications list. This threshold will require a substantial portion of future development to minimize GHG emissions to ensure implementation of AB 32 targets is not impeded. By ensuring that projects that generate more than 900 metric tons of GHG implement mitigation measures to reduce emissions, it is expected that a majority of future development will contribute to emission reduction goals that will assist the region in meeting its GHG reduction targets.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) states that an EIR shall analyze greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a proposed project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

The project is a rezone that would permit eight single family residences and it is expected to generate less than 900 metric tons of GHG emissions based on estimates of GHG emissions for various project types included in the CAPCOA white paper³. Emissions from the project will be generated from vehicle trips, water consumption, waste generation and disposal, and residential fuel consumption. The project's GHG emissions are found to have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to GHG emissions because the project will generate less than 900 metric tons of GHGs.

Furthermore, projects that generate less than 900 metric tons of GHG, will also participate in emission reductions because air emissions including GHGs are under the purview of CARB (or other regulatory agencies) and will be "regulated" either by CARB, the Federal Government, or other entities. For example, new vehicles will be subject to increased fuel economy standards and emission reductions⁴, large and small appliances will be subject to more strict emissions standards, and energy delivered to consumers will increasingly come from renewable sources⁵. As a result, even the emissions that result from projects that produce less than 900 metric tons of GHG will

³ 900 metric tons of GHG emissions are estimated to be generated by 50 Single Family Residential units, 70 apartments/condos, 35,000 sf of general commercial/office, 11,000 sf of retail, or 6,300 sf of supermarket/grocery space.

⁴ On September 15, 2009, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Transportation's National Highway Safety Administration (NHTSA) proposed a national program to reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel economy for new cars and trucks sold in the United States. The proposed standards would cut CO₂ emissions by an estimated 950 million metric tons and 1.8 billion barrels of oil over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program.

⁵ California's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) requires electric corporations to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources by at least 1% of their retail sales annually, until they reach 20% by 2010. In 2008, the governor signed Executive Order S-14-08 (EO) to streamline California's renewable energy project approval process and increase the state's Renewable Energy Standard to 33% renewable power by 2020. The Air Resources Board is in the process of developing regulations to implement the 33% standard known as the California Renewable Electricity Standard (RES).

be subject to emission reductions. Likewise, the project would also participate in the mandated emissions reductions through energy and resource use that is subject to emission reduction mandates beyond “business-as-usual.”

Therefore, it is determined that the project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. Development of regional targets is underway and SANDAG is in the process of preparing the region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which will be a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy will identify how regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible.

To implement State mandates to address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The County of San Diego is currently in the process of updating its General Plan and incorporating associated climate change policies. These policies will provide direction

for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets.

Until local plans are developed to address greenhouse gas emissions, such as a local Sustainable Communities Strategy and updated General Plan Policies, the project is evaluated to determine whether it would impede the implementation of AB 32 GHG reduction targets. For the reasons discussed in the response to question VII.a), the project would not impede the implementation of AB 32 reduction targets. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

.. Potentially Significant Impact

.. Less than Significant Impact

.. Potentially Significant Unless
Mitigation Incorporated

p No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

- b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

.. Potentially Significant Impact

.. Less than Significant Impact

.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation
Incorporated

p No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Although the project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing school, the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

.. Potentially Significant Impact	.. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), within a Federal

Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface, or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

- i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County

unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY
RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE
RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated:

The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, and water supply specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County and Appendix II-A, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. According to the Maria Development Fire Protection Plan received January 8, 2010, a combination of fuel treatment, the building of an 8 foot non-combustible wall with an emergency irrigation system and additional construction features will provide the same practical effect 100 feet of fuel management and protect the structures for the projected 31 foot flame lengths on the south. The 8 foot non-combustible wall has been identified on the Site Plan 10-010 for the southern lots #6, 7, 8, and 30 and will be required at the time of a building permit.

Additionally, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated September 12, 2008, have been received from the San Miguel Fire Protection District. The conditions from the San Miguel Fire Protection District include requirements pertaining to: Access Roads and Gates, Water Supply, Ignition Resistant Construction and required Fuel Modification Zones. The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be four minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County Public Facilities Element is five minutes. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A and through compliance with the San Miguel Fire Protection District's conditions, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A.

- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken

coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Although the project is located north of the Sweetwater River Preserve, which may contain vectors, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors. The project site is in an urbanized area and the Sweetwater River Preserve is managed for vectors. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase future resident's exposure to vectors and a less than significant impact related to vectors would occur.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a Rezone to change setback requirements and it does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB). In addition, the project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff or land use activities that would require special site design considerations, source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) or treatment control BMPs, under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001).

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project lies in the 909.21/Jamacha hydrologic subarea, within the San Diego Bay hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, June 2007, although portions of the San Diego Bay are impaired for coliform bacteria, no portion of the Sweetwater River, which is tributary to the Bay, is impaired. Constituents of concern in the Sweetwater River watershed include coliform bacteria and trace metals. However, the project does not propose any known source of pollutants or land use activities that might contribute pollutants.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a rezone to change setback requirements and it does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff. In addition the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff off-site.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will obtain its water supply from the Otay Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
----	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------

.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation ..
Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The project proposes a Rezone to change the setback requirements on nine existing residential lots. At the time of construction, the project will implement construction BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water run off. The measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The implementation of construction BMPs will address equipment operation, and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any on-site and downstream drainage swales. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

.. Potentially Significant Impact .. Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation ..
Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a rezone proposing to change setback requirements on nine existing residential lots. The project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of run off because no buildings are proposed at this time. Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

.. Potentially Significant Impact .. Less than Significant Impact

- | | | | |
|----|--|---|-----------|
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |
|----|--|---|-----------|

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a rezone to change setback requirements on nine existing residential lots. The project will not create runoff that will exceed the capacity of existing or proposed storm drain facilities because no development is proposed at this time. Potential drainage and run-off associated with future development is not expected to exceed the capacity of existing facilities given that the area is highly urbanized. Additionally, the project will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing water drainage systems because no development is proposed at this time.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a rezone to change setback requirements on nine existing residential lots. Therefore, it does not propose any known additional sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff off-site.

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project therefore, no impact will occur.

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site therefore, no impact will occur.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | p | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

Less Than Significant: The project site is located along the shore of a lake or reservoir; however, the elevation differential between the proposed development and the shoreline will prevent inundation from a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, staff geologist Jim Bennett has determined that the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, though the project does propose land disturbance that will expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|----------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | p | Less than Significant Impact |
|----|--------------------------------|----------|------------------------------|

.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation ..
Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy Estate Development Area and General Plan Land Use Designation (6) Residential. The project is subject to the policies of the Spring Valley Community Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Spring Valley Community Plan. The current zone is A-70 (Limited Agricultural), which requires a net minimum lot size of 8 acres. However the parcels were created prior to the current zoning being established. The proposed project is legal non-conforming with regard to the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

The project is a rezone to change setback requirements from C to N on nine existing lots of approximately 3,500 sq. ft. in size. The Rezone would change setback requirements to more easily accommodate single-family residential homes on the existing lots, which are much smaller in size than typical A-70 zoned parcels. The proposed rezoning is appropriate because the property's General Plan designation is compatible with the zoning that would typically result in the proposed setbacks.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

.. Potentially Significant Impact b Less than Significant Impact
.. Less Than Significant With Mitigation ..
Incorporated No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3).

However, the project site is surrounded by densely developed land uses including dense single family dwelling units which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not

result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| .. Potentially Significant Impact | .. Less than Significant Impact |
| .. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | b No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned A-70, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000).

Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| .. Potentially Significant Impact | b Less than Significant Impact |
| .. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | .. No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is a rezone to change the setback requirements on nine residential lots. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be limited to those quantities not requiring a Grading Permit. The project will be occupied by residents. Based on a site visit completed by Tim Taylor on July 17, 2010 the surrounding area supports residential uses and is occupied by residents. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may

expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours). Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A-70 that has a one-hour average sound limit of 45 dB. The adjacent properties are zoned A-70 and RS-7 and have one-hour average sound limit of 45 dB. Based on review by staff the project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards, which is 45 dB, because the project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410

The project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	b	No Impact

Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: vehicles. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | | | |
|----|--|----------|------------------------------|
| .. | Potentially Significant Impact | .. | Less than Significant Impact |
| .. | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | p | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact:

The proposed project will not displace existing housing since the site is currently vacant. The addition of 8 additional dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people since the site is currently vacant.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Otay Water District, Spring Valley Sanitation District, San Miguel Fire Protection District, and Grossmont Union High School District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically

altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	b	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves a rezone that will involve the construction of eight additional single family residences that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to pay park fees. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication and thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

With regard to regional recreational facilities, there are over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive acreage of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation, the project will not result

in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project will not result in a cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant amount of regional recreational facilities will be available to County residents.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant:

The proposed project will result in an additional 8 single family residences, which is expected to produce 80 Average Daily Trips (ADT's). The project was reviewed by Larry Hofreiter and was determined not to result in a significant increase in the number of vehicle trips, not exceed volume of capacity ratio on adjacent roads, and not add congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions based on the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic. Therefore, the project will not result in any significant direct impacts on traffic volume in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Also refer to the answer for XV. b. below.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated:

The proposed project will result in an additional 80 Average Daily Trips (ADT). The project was reviewed by Larry Hofreiter and was determined not to exceed a Level of Service (LOS) standard established by the CMA (project does not exceed 2400 ADT). Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project-level impact on the LOS standards established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways.

The proposed project generates 80 ADT. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the unincorporated County that were analyzed by the TIF program, including Jamacha Blvd. and Grand Avenue, which are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. The project trips therefore would contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impacts and mitigation is required.

The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program commits the County to construct additional capacity on identified deficient roadways and includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. This program is based on a summary of projections method contained in an adopted planning document, as referenced in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(1)(B), which evaluates regional or area wide conditions contributing to cumulative transportation impacts. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, public and private funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use

funds from TransNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

The project will participate in the County's TIF program as mitigation for its cumulative impacts.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	p	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impedes adequate site distance on a road.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The San Miguel Fire Protection District has reviewed the proposed project and associated emergency access roadways and has determined that there is adequate

emergency fire access proposed. Additionally, roads used will be required to be improved to County standards.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain existing conditions as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project facility availability form has been received from Spring Valley Sanitation District that indicates the district will serve the project.

Therefore, because the project will be discharging wastewater to a RWQCB permitted community sewer system and will be required to satisfy the conditions listed above, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, including the Regional Basin Plan.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Based on the service availability forms received, the project will not require construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate adequate water and wastewater treatment facilities are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Otay Water District and Spring Valley Sanitation District. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	b	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a rezone proposing to change setback requirements on nine existing residential lots. Construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities will not be required because no development is proposed at this time.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires water service from the Otay Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Otay Water District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires wastewater service from the Spring Valley Sanitation District. A Service Availability Letter from the Spring Valley Sanitation District has been provided, indicating adequate wastewater service capacity is available to serve the requested demand. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations

Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	p	Less than Significant Impact
..	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to

each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly Biological Resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes the transplantation of 30 barrel cactus and the purchase of 0.31-acres of Tier II or higher Tier habitat in the MSCP for Coastal Sage Scrub impacts. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

<p>.. Potentially Significant Impact</p> <p>b Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</p>	<p>.. Less than Significant Impact</p> <p>.. No Impact</p>
--	--

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Mount Miguel Covenant Village Rezone	Rezone 07-012
Brown Site Plan	Site Plan 09-013
Clear Wire Site Plan Modification	Site Plan Modification 00-007-002
Reyes Site Plan	Site Plan 10-012

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As noted earlier, the proposed project generates 80 ADT. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the unincorporated County that were analyzed by the TIF program, including Jamacha Blvd. and Grand Avenue, which are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. The project trips therefore would contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impacts and mitigation is required. The project will contribute to the County's TIF program, which commits the County to construct additional capacity on identified deficient roadways and funds improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts

caused by traffic from future development. Therefore, this project has been determined to result in a less than significant impact with mitigation.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

..	Potentially Significant Impact	..	Less than Significant Impact
p	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	..	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, it was found that the proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, according to the Maria Development Fire Protection Plan received January 8, 2010, a combination of fuel treatment, the building of an 8 foot non-combustible wall with an emergency irrigation system and additional construction features will provide the same practical effect 100 feet of fuel management and protect the structures for the projected 31 foot flame lengths on the south. The 8 foot non-combustible wall has been identified on the Site Plan 10-010 for the southern lots #6, 7, 8, and 30 and will be required at the time of a building permit. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

Negative Cultural Resources Report of a 1 +/- Acre Parcel South of San Carlos Street Between Maria and La Presa Avenues Spring Valley, San Diego County, California, prepared by Philip de Barros of Professional Archeological Services, dated May 10, 2007

Biological Resources Report dated June 18, 2010 prepared by Vincent N. Scheidt

Maria Avenue Development Fire Protection Plan dated December 19, 2009 prepared by Firewise 2000, Inc.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances.
(www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000
(<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.
(www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.
(www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
(www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
(www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
(www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.
(www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2.
(www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.

(www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and

Reconstruction Projects," October 1998.
(www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities
Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084.
(www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and
Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-
By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee
Reports, March 2005.
(<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report.
January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report,
County of San Diego, January 2005.
(<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit
Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report,
April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional
Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego
Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive
Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown
Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991),
Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994).
(www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation
Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace,
Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural
Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27,
Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste.
(ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public
Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management,
Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78:
Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization
Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource
Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the
San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation
Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace,
Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
(BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway
Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for
Highway Projects.